restriction by type-locality-fixation alone, since the latter is covered only by optional recommendations. A revised Code should not leave this question to answer by ambiguous inference.

*Hybrids and Intergrades.* It is a curious fact that no mention is made in the 1961 Code of intergrades and only brief references to hybrids occur (Arts. 1, 17). It is curious because these are commonplace in modern taxonomic thought and because specific rules pertaining to names based upon them are necessary. For taxonomic purposes hybrids may be regarded as either interspecific hybrids or intersubspecific hybrids ; the latter are often regarded as " intergrades " but the two terms are not synonymous since non-hybrid intergrades between subspecies are well known as, for example, an insular population intermediate in character between (but not interbreeding with) adjacent insular populations on either side representing different subspecies. A clearcut definition of these terms would be useful in a modern Code.

The greatest question posed by hybrids and intergrades in taxonomy is the fate of names inadvertently based upon them. A clear cut directive should be added to the Code permitting such names arbitrarily and irrevocably to be fixed with either parent population by the first reviser.

## Document 8/2

## NAMES GIVEN TO HYBRIDS

By Ernst Mayr (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*)

Working with the Code last year, I discovered one disturbing omission. It relates to hybrids. Articles 1 and 17 clearly state that names given to hybrids as such have no standing in nomenclature, while names given in ignorance of the hybrid nature retain their standing. This unquestionably is wise because it prevents the confusing use of a homonymous name in the same genus.

Unfortunately, Article 17(2) seems to have confused some authors and I know of at least one case where an author has applied the name of a species hybrid to one of the parental species when for nomenclatural reasons the name of this parental species became unavailable. Such a transfer of a name from a hybrid to one of the parental species seems to me highly undesirable and in conflict with some of the basic principles of nomenclature :

(1) Hybridization is a potential form of species formation. This form of species formation is widespread in plants and may well occur also in animals. It would be most confusing if the same name could be used for one of the parental species and also for the descendant hybrid species.

(2) The type of the hybrid could not be used as " the standard of reference that determines the application " (Article 61) of the name because this specimen does not typify either of the parental species.

(3) A hybrid is not a composite, like a composite type series or an artifact, but an indivisible new combination of genes, producing an individual which no first reviser can separate into its elements.

For these reasons it should be made clear in the Rules somewhere that the name of a hybrid is of significance only in homonymy but not in synonymy. Perhaps one should add at the end of Article 24b the following sentence :

" A name given to a species hybrid cannot be applied to either of the parental species."

If other proposals for changes in the Code are to be submitted to the Commission, it might be advisable to consider also the one suggested above.